



Dogsthorpe: Cllr Ash, Cllr Miners & Cllr Saltmarsh  
East: Cllr Collins, Cllr Todd & Cllr Goldspink  
Park: Cllr Kreling, Cllr Peach & Cllr Lowndes (Chairman)

***DRAFT MINUTES***  
***Of a meeting of the***  
***Dogsthorpe, East and Park Neighbourhood Council***  
***(Area Central & East 2)***

***on***  
***On Tuesday 14 December 2010 at 7.00 pm at***  
***The Kings School, Park Road, Peterborough***

***\*\*PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL CONFIRMED***  
***AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THIS NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL \*\****

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Cllr Saltmarsh (Chairman)  
Cllr Collins  
Cllr Goldspink (for part of meeting)  
Cllr Miners  
Cllr Peach  
Cllr Todd

**OFFICERS PRESENT:**

Peter Bezant	Private Sector Housing Enforcement Officer (for part of meeting)
Mark Denson	Neighbourhood Environment Enforcement Officer
Alana Diffey	Governance Officer
Cate Harding	Neighbourhood Manager, Central & East Locality
Louise McAvoy	Neighbourhood Development Worker (for part of meeting)
Rachel Thornton	Media and Communications Manager

12 members of the public attended, including representatives of the following organisations: East and North Neighbourhood Panel, Park Ward Labour Party, ODRA / Innova, Bluebell Residents Association, Garton End, the Police, Cross Keys Homes and Elizabeth Court Residents Association.

The Chairman gave thanks to Louise McAvoy for her efforts and gave her best wishes for her future.

ITEM	DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS	ACTION
1. Apologies	Apologies were received from Councillor Lowndes (Chairman) and Councillor Ash. In the absence of the Chairman, Councillor Saltmarsh, as Vice Chairman, chaired the meeting.	
2. Declarations of Interest	There were no declarations of interest.	
3. Minutes of the previous meeting	The minutes of the meeting held on 1 September 2010 were approved as a true and accurate record.	
4. Digital Switch Over	<p>Mr Ed Moss of Eaga gave a brief presentation on the Digital Switchover Help Scheme, which sought to assist eligible individuals to prepare for the change to digital television. Mr Moss informed the meeting that it was estimated that there were at least 95,000 people in Peterborough who were eligible to receive support through the scheme and encouraged attendees to ensure those people that they thought may be eligible came forward for help.</p> <p>In response to questions raised by attendees, Mr Moss responded as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mr Moss was willing to provide information to community groups or to attend other meetings to get the message across. Mr Moss was also happy to assist those people who were eligible for assistance to sort out the installation.</li> <li>▪ The digital signal will be boosted in strength when the analogue is turned off.</li> <li>▪ There was no such thing as a digital aerial, only a high gain aerial which was slightly better. If you receive a good analogue signal, your aerial will receive a good digital signal.</li> <li>▪ Those people currently on Sky or Virgin cable will not have to do anything and could carry on as normal, unless the box was to break or an old television was in use.</li> <li>▪ DVD players will still work, as will video players, however a separate digibox would be required to enable you to record programs that you were not watching at the time.</li> <li>▪ The installation package did not include a replacement aerial, as 95% of those already installed were good enough to receive the digital signal.</li> <li>▪ Those using the scheme would also receive 1 year of ongoing, unlimited support.</li> </ul>	
5. Open Session	<p><u>John Mansfield School</u></p> <p>It was noted that the demolition of John Mansfield School had</p>	

commenced and that everything was in hand to join with the youth club and proceed with the project. It was hoped that at the next meeting, visible progress could be reported.

#### Section 106 Funds & Localism Bill

Councillor Collins sought clarification as to how much detail had been received regarding new S106 arrangements proposed under the Localism Bill.

The Neighbourhood Manager advised that it was still very early days and that the Bill had a fairly detailed process to go through before it was adopted however it was an exciting opportunity that was watched with great interest. There was a proposal within the Bill that would promote an exciting opportunity to have neighbourhood plans, in the spirit of Big Society. Neighbourhood Management were working closely with the Planning Department to ensure planning for local areas was happening in a joined up way. It was hoped that Community Action Plans would be developed into statutory, supplementary planning documents.

The Chairman reported that she attended a course in London about the new licensing laws and how localism will affect them and give local people more say in deciding applications. The Chairman felt that this was a positive change.

#### Neighbourhood Management Team changes

The Neighbourhood Manager assured attendees that the Neighbourhoods Team did still exist following the restructure, with neighbourhood managers now able to concentrate on strategic growth and regeneration of communities and future planning opportunities. The teams that Councillors and residents are familiar with still exist.

The Neighbourhood Manager advised that 'locality facing objective' was jargon which meant that when neighbourhood services were introduced 18 months ago, the city was divided up into 3 localities. Neighbourhoods can self define themselves, however when officers use the term 'locality', the larger 'neighbourhood areas' are meant.

#### Local Development Framework

It was noted that the Local Development Framework was agreed at Council recently, following which there was to be a 2 month consultation period with the public before final submission to the secretary of state. What role would the Neighbourhood Council play in the consultation?

The Neighbourhood Manager advised that as the neighbourhood councils meet on a quarterly basis, it was difficult to bring issues such as these to meetings to deal with in a timely fashion. There is an informed planning process to address anything that can't wait for the next public meeting.

#### EDL March Feedback

Police Inspector Dominic Glazebrook provided an update on events over the weekend where the EDL and TUC held counter protests in Peterborough. It was a very long day with around 800 to 1000 EDL protesters and similar numbers from the UAF and TUC. The Police Inspector was pleased to report that there were only 10 arrests associated with the operation, which compares favourably with others held around the country. Nobody was injured during the activities, and there was no property damaged. Police had received favourable feedback from many sections of the community. The reason that the day remained largely peaceful could be attributed to the fact that the community cohesion prior to the march was very strong with many parts of the community working together. The Police Inspector said that the highlight of his day was at the Cathedral the following afternoon, where 300 to 400 people gathered, holding candles, reciting a declaration of peace and harmony for Peterborough which was a really strong and moving message. The Police Inspector gave thanks to everyone who helped to make it a peaceful day.

#### Review of Neighbourhood Councils

The Neighbourhood Manager advised that Scrutiny were currently undertaking a review of the neighbourhood council model following its implementation 18 months ago and asked attendees to complete the survey from the task and finish group so that their views may be considered.

Councillor Goldspink further commented that the Strong and Supportive Scrutiny Committee had sought the review of neighbourhood councils and had agreed to set up a small task and finish group to seek views and form opinions of what might happen in the future. The proposal to cut neighbourhood council meetings back to only two a year saved only £6,000 per year. Councillor Goldspink encouraged attendees to provide their views by filling in the feedback forms.

#### Victoria Park Improvements

Comments were made by residents who had concerns as to why £35,000 in Section 106 funds were being spent on refurbishment and enhancement of Victoria Park, when:

- The results of a recent community survey undertaken by the Labour group in Park Ward revealed that the general feeling was that tackling antisocial behaviour in the park and increasing feelings of safety were the greatest concern.
- Residents were generally in favour of money being spent in the area as it doesn't happen often, however it was felt that there were other projects in the area that would benefit from such funds, for example the school crossing on Queens Drive.

The Neighbourhood Manager advised that improvements for the park were specified within the section 106 agreement for the particular housing development and so could not be changed, but took the comments on board. The improvements at the park could

	<p>happen in a timely way in line with the needs of the community, and if the entire sum of money wasn't used it could be ringfenced for future works within the immediate vicinity following liaison with planning services. The Neighbourhood Manager said it had been good to attend the Victoria Park Residents Association meeting and as they are a key group they will continue to be consulted on this matter.</p> <p>Councillor Peach commented that hopefully, depending on what residents suggest in terms of improvements for the park, these improvements would go some way to alleviating the problems and antisocial behaviour issues already highlighted.</p>	
<p>6. Houses of Multiple Occupation</p>	<p>Peter Bezant, the Neighbourhood Housing Enforcement Officer working exclusively in the Central and East Area of the city, gave a presentation on Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs). During his presentation, the Neighbourhood Housing Enforcement Officer explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A HMO was a property that constitutes two or more living units, not a converted property. A HMO exists where the people living in the property do not form a single household. The property would have to be the occupants' only or main residence.</li> <li>▪ A HMO exists where rent or similar to rent is paid by at least 1 occupant, and where two or more of the households share at least one basic amenity, eg kitchens and bathrooms.</li> <li>▪ A household was, in simple terms, anything ranging from a single person up to a family of eight to 12 individuals.</li> <li>▪ A HMO was not a property converted into self contained flats or a house with a lot of people living in it.</li> <li>▪ The Council deals with the licensing of HMOs, and there were currently two schemes in place: the Mandatory Scheme that was applied nationally and accounted for larger properties of three storeys or more, and the localised Additional Scheme which covered smaller properties and the was predominantly used in the areas of Millfield and New England. The types of properties under the Additional Scheme were predominantly two storey, with three or more people forming two or more households.</li> <li>▪ The Neighbourhood Housing Enforcement Officer not only dealt with HMOs but also anything to do with property conditions where the landlord or his appointed agent failed to address issues such as blocked drains, damp, lack of heating. The Neighbourhood Housing Enforcement Officer had enforcement powers to ensure that buildings were suitable for people to live in.</li> </ul> <p>In response to questions raised, the Neighbourhood Housing Enforcement Officer commented as follows:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A group of friends renting together would technically constitute a HMO by definition. The fact that the people are not related makes this so, however it is a case of looking at the level of risk that this creates for the people living in the premises and their standard of living. This kind of rented accommodation can work very well, however it is the higher risk situations where people have their own lockable doors and pay their own rent that Enforcement Officers were concerned with.</li> <li>▪ There was no list of landlords available to the public as the Council was not within its rights to release this information. Residents were encouraged to notify the Council if they had any concerns or wanted to report any irregular activities.</li> <li>▪ In response to a question raised by Councillor Todd, the Neighbourhood Housing Enforcement Officer advised that in terms of PAT testing, the Council does not get involved. The Council focussed on ensuring that premises met the standards for minimum living space and amenities.</li> </ul> <p>The Neighbourhood Manager advised that following concerns raised by residents regarding university lettings, the lettings for the university were handled by two reputable agents who were currently managing three properties and fifteen students. There were two properties in Bretton and one in the city, and the same HMO standards applied and the agents had been made aware of these requirements.</p>	
<p>7. Neighbourhood Council Budget 2010/2011</p>	<p>The Dogsthorpe, East and Park Neighbourhood Council considered a report detailing proposals for the allocation of the capital budget of £25,000 for 2010/2011. Councillor Collins introduced the report, advising that the Neighbourhood Council had £25,000 in capital funds available for improvements within the neighbourhood council area. In presenting the item, Councillor Collins explained that the areas suggested for improvement were broad areas which needed to be expanded on, and once areas were agreed proper quotes to determine exact costings would need to be obtained and as a result the areas may need some prioritisations.</p> <p>During consideration, the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Comments were raised regarding the reinstatement of a free large rubbish collection service, which may impact on the high increase in fly tipping locally.</li> <li>▪ With regard to the contribution towards noise monitoring equipment, the Neighbourhoods Team would ensure that this equipment remained properly calibrated and in good working order. The additional resources were proposed for purchase in response to overwhelming complaints regarding noise in the area and would enable officers to respond in a more timely fashion.</li> </ul> <p>Cllr Peach not object but during discussion but a lot of discussion about damage to verges item, although we are not against</p>	

proposals if it did work out to have more money for that particular topic, particularly bad problem for many areas within the wards, good value with more money. Variations to be determined by the neighbourhood manage.

- There was a lot of discussion about damage to verges and the Neighbourhood Manager agreed to consider contributing further funds to this item if any savings on the other budget items were made.

The Neighbourhood Council **RESOLVED** to approve an allocation of the budget to the following proposals

Item	Detail	£ (Estimated)
Purchase pool of equipment for community use	To increase the capacity for local communities to become involved in projects and volunteering activities such as Community Action Days, it is proposed to purchase high quality gardening, painting and litter picking equipment, including personal protective equipment. This would be stored locally and be accessible for organised activities in the neighbourhood.	£1000.00
Improve Fear of Crime / Safety in underpasses	Projects involving local people to brighten up potentially using street art	£1000.00
Damage to verges	Improvement to damaged communal grass verges including preventative measures to avoid reoccurrence. This intervention is in addition to the direct enforcement activity at individual properties that are persistently abused	£6650.00
No fly-tipping and No dog fouling signs	Purchase signs for use in target locations within the neighbourhood in order to raise awareness and act as a deterrent.	£600.00
Contribution towards noise monitoring	This amount is requested as a 'pooled' contribution between all Neighbourhood Councils towards purchase of additional	£750.00

	equipment	noise monitoring equipment for use by the Pollution Control Team. PCC have identified funds to purchase much needed up to date equipment, however for a small additional contribution we would be able to increase the amount of items and thereby greatly increase our capacity to respond to neighbourhood issues relating to Statutory Noise complaints, analysis for planning applications and monitoring of live music events.		
	Investment towards improvements in parks/open spaces	Highest priority during consultation and the amount would be allocated for improvements across the neighbourhood following further agreement and involvement with local communities. £3000 per ward	£9000.00	
	Provision for young people	This is proposed for purchase of additional equipment for young people in the area. Young people would be involved in the identification of projects/equipment in the coming weeks.	£6000.00	
	TOTAL		£25,000.00	
8. PCC Full Council Budget 2011/2012	<p>The Chairman read a statement which explained the impact of the central government's budget settlement being received later than expected on the Council's ability to consult on budget proposals for the forthcoming year. The Chairman advised that a consultation event would take place on 10 January 2011, for the whole of the locality, to discuss this important item. The meeting would take at Gladstone Park Community Centre immediately prior to the already scheduled Central and North Neighbourhood Council meeting on that evening.</p> <p>The statement read by the Chairman was as follows:</p> <p><i>Peterborough City Council will receive a £15 million cut in Government funding over the next two years.</i></p> <p><i>According to the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement</i></p>			



	<p><i>released on 13 December 2010, the city council will lose £8.9 million (10.1 per cent) of its formula grant for 2011/12 and a further £5.6 million (7.8 per cent) for 2012/13.</i></p> <p><i>The announcement appears to show that the council will receive £2.6 million less than it had predicted in its October budget report for 2011/12. The announcement also appears to show the council will receive £4.3 million less than was predicted for 2012/13. The council said the reason its predictions were different to the Government's announcement is because of changes in the way the Government calculates how funding is allocated.</i></p> <p><i>Leader of the council, Councillor Marco Cereste, said: "All councils knew they would be getting less funding next year as part of the Government's strategy to cut the national deficit. However, the announcement yesterday shows we will receive less Government funding than we predicted in Peterborough because of changes in the way the Government calculates how it distributes its funding.</i></p> <p><i>"I still believe Peterborough is in a very strong position because of the work we have already put into this year's budget process. In putting together our budget proposals at the end of October we made predictions about how we thought Peterborough would be affected by the cuts. We published these proposals earlier than most other councils to give residents, businesses and our partners the opportunity to give their feedback on our ideas.</i></p> <p><i>"We will now be working with our finance team and senior managers to decide how we take this budget forward and any changes we may need to make. However, at this stage I do not believe that we need to make any significant changes in light of this announcement or that it will lead to many more job losses than already announced.</i></p> <p><i>"The Cabinet and I will now be looking to assess all the feedback we have received so far, and any further feedback still to come in, to enable our final budget proposals to be considered by Cabinet on 7 February 2011. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those people who have already given their views and remind people there is still time to have your say on our budget proposals."</i></p>	
<p>9. Street Leader Scheme</p>	<p>Mark Denson, Neighbourhood Environment Enforcement Officer and Street Leader Coordinator introduced the item, explaining that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Scheme had been created under the Greater Dogsthorpe Partnership in 2007 and was the first of its kind to be devised in Peterborough.</li> <li>▪ Following the Scheme's success in Dogsthorpe, the scheme was adopted by Peterborough City Council in 2008 and currently had 170 active street leaders, with 48 based in the Central and East locality.</li> <li>▪ The purpose of the Scheme was to get local residents involved in their areas and to enable them to tackle environmental crime by reporting it directly to the Council so that action could be taken.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Street Leader role itself is to act as a direct point of contact for the local community to report any environmental issues concerning them in their area such as fly tipping, waste bins, untaxed cars, street lighting. If they feel that these issues have not been addressed, they can request further investigation.</li> <li>▪ Street Leaders work proactively with residents groups to see what assistance they can provide and assist Neighbourhood Services with various community campaigns. One of the important things about the Scheme was that participants could contribute as much or as little as they would like to – some Street Leaders are very proactive, and others simply wish to report things they see on their daily travels.</li> <li>▪ The Scheme was currently under review to assess the current numbers and to see how many of the Street Leaders wanted to continue, and to see how many were interested in other neighbourhood initiatives.</li> </ul> <p>During discussion, the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The role of the Street Leader was considered highly valuable to local communities and Peterborough City Council responded very quickly to reports of fly tipping in the area, however some issues took much longer to resolve – issues around parking signs on Waterloo Road for example. A more consistent response was requested.</li> <li>▪ It was considered that there was an opportunity to rationalise all the various community programmes and bring them together, such as Speedwatch, Neighbourhood Watch, Street Leader scheme.</li> <li>▪ Street Leaders were proud of the work they did in their communities, being active members of their communities and providing a voice for those who otherwise might feel they didn't have one when it came to these issues.</li> </ul>	
10. Next Meeting	<p>The Chairman reminded attendees about the additional briefing on 10 January at the Gladstone Park Community Centre for the purpose of receiving information about the Peterborough City Council Budget, and advised that the next meeting of the Dogsthorpe, East and Park Neighbourhood Council would be held on 29 March 2011 commencing at 7pm at the Dogsthorpe Junior School, Central Avenue, Dogsthorpe.</p>	

**Meeting closed at 8.51pm.**